

SECRET

25X1

15 MAY 1963

DIA DECLASSIFICATION/RELEASE INSTRUCTIONS ON FILE

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: DIA Reluctance to Engage in Thorough Study of
Soviet Ground Forces Requested by the
Secretary of Defense

1. At the request of Colonel Teberg of DIA, a meeting was held on 10 May to discuss the terms of reference for the restudy of the Soviet ground forces. (Participants listed in Attachment 1.) The meeting showed that DIA does not want to restudy the problem and is rather resentful of CIA's efforts in that direction. Teberg did not have terms of reference to offer and flatly refused to discuss the terms we had presented at the 22 April meeting (Attachment 2, Memo for the Record, 26 April 1963). He said there had been no discussion of our paper within DIA because they considered their remarks at the 22 April meeting to have constituted an absolute rejection. (A feeling in no way shared by CIA participants.)

2. Teberg presented a list of points (Attachment 2) drawn up by DIA. The DIA position is that the study which they have just completed must be the point of departure for the joint CIA-DIA study and that only information from unexploited sources could change conclusions already arrived at in the DIA study. DIA feels that the firmer position taken in their new study will convince consumers, previously unconvinced, although the study appears to have the same old answers. We have not seen the report, but are to get copies this week (13-17 May).

3. I stated that until I had seen the DIA study I could not comment on its acceptability. However, if, for example, the estimate of Soviet line divisions was as presented in the DIA briefing we had received on 3 May, I could not endorse the results on the basis of the information we had received to date. I agreed that higher priority should be obtained for the collection and processing of information and that we had already taken

25X1

SECRET

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

~~SECRET~~

25X1

steps to do this in CIA,* but that higher priority alone would not answer all the questions. The information in hand would also have to be reconsidered. If we are to meet the August date for a preliminary report, we cannot wait for the new information.

4. All suggestions for further progress were either rejected by DIA or accepted reluctantly. I submitted the names of CIA personnel for panel membership (Attachment 3). After twice ignoring requests for the names of DIA members of the panel, Teberg finally said that DIA membership would depend upon the terms of reference (although approving the terms should be one of the tasks of the panel). I also presented a proposed plan for the operation of the panel (Attachment 4), but Teberg refused to discuss this also.

5. In sum, DIA's tactics were dilatory and obstructive. Teberg's manner seemed to embarrass the other DIA participants. It is my conclusion that Colonel Teberg as DIA spokesman would not commit DIA to anything and that his instructions were to get CIA to endorse the study which DIA had just prepared. I do not know how far up the line this policy had been cleared, but knowing Teberg, I would assume that it has been checked either with General Hall or General Carroll.

Chief, Military-Economic Division, OMB

Attachments:

As stated above

25X1A9A

25X1A9A

~~SECRET~~

25X1

25X1

Approved For Release 2006/03/10 : CIA-RDP79B00972A000100190018-2

Approved For Release 2006/03/10 : CIA-RDP79B00972A000100190018-2